UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-NINTH YEAR

2557th MEETING: 7 SEPTEMBER 1984

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2557)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 4 September 1984 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Nicaragua to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16731)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2557th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 7 September 1984, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Elleck Kufakunesu MASHINGAIDZE (Zimbabwe).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Burkina Faso, China, Egypt, France, India, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2557)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Letter dated 4 September 1984 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Nicaragua to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16731)

The meeting was called to order at 4.10 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 4 September 1984 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Nicaragua to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16731)

1. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on the agenda. The Council is meeting today in response to the request contained in the letter dated 4 September 1984 from the representative of Nicaragua to the President of the Security Council [*S/16731*]. The first speaker is the representative of Nicaragua.

2. Mr. CHAMORRO MORA (Nicaragua) [*interpretation from Spanish*]: On 1 September in the small town of Santa Clara, department of Nueva Segovia, four children were gathering fruit in the countryside while their mother was preparing food for a training centre. Suddenly, three small aeroplanes and a helicopter dropped from the sky, frightening the children. They ran to the buildings in search of protection, not knowing that those structures were the target of a terrorist band that opened fire on the school, killing those children and a maintenance worker and wounding two women.

3. Every parent knows what the death of a child means, but for Nicaragua those deaths are particularly painful because they are part of a sad chain of similar deaths that have had to be confronted in the past four years by our mothers and fathers, our brothers and sisters. During this period, several thousand Nicaraguans have been the victims of terrorist attacks from abroad. For a small nation of approximately 3 million persons, this is a truly tragic figure.

4. Just as we mourn the deaths of our own people, on this occasion and for the first time two American families are mourning the deaths of two of their children on Nicaraguan soil, a situation which, in addition to being regrettable, is one which is of concern to us because we do not want either Nicaraguans or Americans to die because of the unthinking policy of the Reagan Administration whose logical result, in continuing this senseless and overt war, would be more deaths of other American citizens. While we regret the deaths of our own citizens, we regret the fact that in that attack two United States citizens died.

5. Our Minister for External Relations called the families of the Americans who died and offered our assistance in the return of their bodies. They were invited to come to Nicaragua to claim them. The families expressed their appreciation for the information provided by Minister D'Escoto Brockmann, because the only news they had received before then came from the United States mass media. We have since learned that the State Department is exerting pressure on Mr. Parker, the father of one of those killed, telling him that because of our intransigence the negotiations for the return of the bodies might be delayed several weeks, whereas it is they who did not want to recognize that citizens of this country were involved and it is they who are now delaying the process of the return.

6. Just five months and five days ago—to be exact, between 30 March and 4 April—we last appeared before this body, which is entrusted with safeguarding international peace and security, and denounced the air and naval war, including the mining of our ports, that the American Administration through its Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and its mercenaries was waging against my country and our revolution.

7. On that occasion we denounced before the international community and the members of this Council the direct involvement of United States citizens, members of the CIA and of the United States armed forces in those criminal acts which are violations of international law. We stressed the State terrorism that is the offi-

cial policy of the present United States Administration in Central America, in particular against Nicaragua, pointing out that turning other countries of the region into aircraft carriers of their own fleet for the conduct of their so-called covert war involved serious risks for the stability of the region and placed us on the brink of a regional war.

8. We recall that on that occasion Mrs. Kirkpatrick and other members of her delegation cynically evaded a response to our accusations by vetoing a draft resolution submitted by Nicaragua [*S/16463*] which received 13 votes in favour and 1 abstention and which basically asked that Nicaragua be allowed free exercise of its right to self-determination and respect for its national sovereignty and independence by an end to the blockade of its ports.

9. In connection with that debate [*2525th and 2527th to 2529th meetings*], its denunciations, its development and its outcome, in which a large number of Members of the United Nations expressed concern and amazement, it is noteworthy that just a few days later the United States Government, in contradiction to the statements made by top members of its delegation before this forum, publicly acknowledged its direct participation in the mining of our ports through the use of mother ships and of Piraña speedboats guided by CIA experts —exactly what we had denounced during that debate. The United States Government acknowledged the direct involvement of its personnel in such speedboat attacks a few months earlier on oil storage facilities in the Nicaraguan port of Corinto, as a result of which we had to evacuate 25,000 persons from the port.

10. I believe it important to remind the international community, before referring to the facts that have compelled us to convene the Council once again, that just five days after the conclusion of that debate my Government decided to lodge a complaint against the United States of America before the International Court of Justice in order to deal with violations of international law brought about by the criminal policy of State terrorism and the acts of aggression systematically carried out against the Sandinist people's revolution.

11. It is of interest to recall that at that time the United States, which throughout its history has proclaimed itself the defender of international law and has used the International Court whenever it suited its interests, said it would not recognize the Court's jurisdiction on this issue for a period of two years, thus trying not to face up to the justice of our complaint and its consistency with the policy of truth and legality that characterizes our revolution. For her part, Mrs. Kirkpatrick not only questioned the apolitical nature and impartiality of the Court, comparing it with the General Assembly, but also called into question international norms against intervention and the use of force.

12. It is also worth recalling that at that time we requested the Court, in view of the gravity of the situation, to take provisional measures, which were proclaimed in its opinion of 10 May 1984. In this connection I quote paragraphs 1 and 2 of that opinion:

> "The United States of America should immediately cease and refrain from any action restricting, blocking or endangering access to or from Nicaraguan ports, and, in particular, the laying of mines;
>
> "The right to sovereignty and to political independence possessed by the Republic of Nicaragua, like any other State of the region or of the world, should be fully respected and should not in any way be jeopardized by any military and paramilitary activities which are prohibited by the principles of international law, in particular, the principle that States should refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or the political independence of any State, and the principle concerning the duty not to intervene in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of a State, principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and the Charter of the Organization of American States."[1]

13. Subsequently the United States Government once again cynically declared that it was not at that time carrying out any action contrary to the recommendation of the International Court.

14. I wanted to make those preliminary comments, which might be described as a recounting of recent history, because the acts of aggression, far from coming to an end, have continued in different forms, like those in the first three months of the year which prompted our previous appeal to the Council.

15. On this occasion we do not intend to stress the various aspects of the covert war waged by the CIA, which we have already thoroughly denounced in the debates in March, even though the guiding hand of the Agency is constantly discernible in all these actions. On the contrary, we wish to stress now what is becoming a direct American presence in various forms and manifestations, which in recent days has resulted in the downing of a C-47 aircraft and a UH-500D helicopter and the deaths of two United States citizens.

16. We are extremely concerned about the increasing involvement of United States citizens, CIA mercenaries, in the no-longer-covert war against our country. Throughout the past four years we have been alerting the international community and the Government and people of the United States to the consequences of this increasing involvement.

17. We are convinced that the members of the Council will recall that since the beginning of this year there has been a series of air raids on our territory in which citizens of the United States as well as of Honduras have died. It will be recalled that on 10 January an American helicopter entered the Nicaraguan region of

Jalapa. It later fell in Honduran territory, with the death of American mercenary Jeffrey Waft. On 8 May a helicopter was shot down in our territory near the port of Potosí, a United States UH-1D helicopter of the Honduran air force coming from the Isla del Tigre in Honduran territory. Eight Honduran soldiers were killed in the crash.

18. Today we appear before the Council to denounce two new incidents. On 27 August a United States C-47 aircraft from the El Aguacate air base in the department of Olancho, Honduras, entered our territory. It was downed, resulting in the deaths of eight mercenaries, including the pilot Anastasio Somoza Portocarrero, Lieutenant-Colonel of the ex-Somozan Guard, an acknowledged assassin of our people and a mercenary in the service of the CIA—but, of course, a "freedom fighter" of President Reagan.

19. The most recent incident, in which two United States citizens died, occurred on Saturday, 1 September, when a UH-500D helicopter and three push and pull airplanes entered our territory in tactical combat formation and attacked the patriotic military service school in Santa Clara, in the department of Nueva Segovia. Those combat planes fired from 12 to 16 rockets at the school before the helicopter was downed.

20. Who were the Nicaraguans killed who were added to the long list of heroes and martyrs of our country, and what were they doing? This time they were four children and a construction worker who were gathering fruit, as well as two women who were wounded while doing civilian work at the school.

21. Who were the United States citizens, and what were they doing? While the Reagan Administration is thinking up the answer, its own people and journalists are giving it to us.

22. Dana Parker and James Powell are not just ordinary American citizens, as President Reagan and his spokesmen would have us believe, as they try to evade any responsibility for that action and cynically blame the United States Congress for the deaths because of cuts in CIA funds.

23. Can two ordinary American citizens travel with such impunity to Honduras? We remember the group of American nuns that wanted to visit Honduras at the beginning of this year for a religious vigil at the border with Nicaragua. When they landed in a commercial aircraft the aircraft was surrounded by Honduran military personnel and the group was obliged to leave the country immediately.

24. Can two ordinary United States citizens have contacts with their embassy in Tegucigalpa? Here again what comes to mind is the fact that those same American nuns when surrounded by Honduran military personnel at the airport asked to contact American officials, and even though those officials were present at the airport they refused to help them.

25. What did the United States Government know about the activities of six United States mercenaries operating from Honduras at the end of August 1984, and when and how did the information reach it? What did the United States Government know about the activities of a group which calls itself "Civilian Military Assistance", and when and how did that information reach it? Why is it that the United States, which supposedly had been investigating that group since April 1984, took no action to prevent it or its members violating the law of the United States? In particular, why did it not begin legal proceedings under Title 18, Section 960, of the United States Code? How does the Government of the United States justify the persecution of individuals participating in illegal military activities against Dominica and Haiti when it closes its eyes to those who do the same against Nicaragua? What contacts has the United States Government had with any of the six mercenaries? When did those contacts take place? What contacts has the Government of the United States had with the group Civilian Military Assistance, and when did those contacts take place?

26. What contacts have there been between the Government of the United States and Tom Posey, and when did they take place? Did the United States Government help Posey in his contacts with the Honduran military forces or in his trip to Honduras last January?

27. Was the United States Government informed of the presence of the mercenaries in Honduras before the attack on Santa Clara? When and how was it informed? Does the Government of the United States intend to compensate Nicaragua for the loss of life—four children killed—caused by the attack in which the American mercenaries took part?

28. Can two ordinary American citizens enter United States military bases in Honduras and even train mercenaries in flight and combat techniques? Was the United States Government informed that the mercenaries were providing military training at an air base —Jamastrán—built by United States military forces? When and how was it informed? Can two ordinary American citizens make use of CIA planes or helicopters without the consent of the United States intelligence staff of the base? Can they carry aerial navigation maps with two flight plans: the first departing from the El Aguacate base, built by the United States Army on Honduran territory, and heading for Las Vegas; the second departing from Toncontín towards Jamastrán, and from this base, also built by the United States, going towards Santa Clara in our territory? Copies of these maps with the flight routes have been provided to the members of the Council. Was the United States Government informed that two of the mercenaries were piloting a CIA helicopter? When and how was it so informed?

29. Only United States citizens closely linked to the CIA can enter and make use of all the infrastructure that that Agency has set up in Honduras as a spearhead for

aggression against Nicaragua. As the Minister for External Relations of my country, Mr. Miguel D'Escoto Brockmann, has stated, there is no operation against military or economic targets in my country that is not directly authorized by the American CIA.

30. We are also concerned that, in violation of United States laws, mercenaries are being hired through American magazines and that there are groups such as the so-called Civilian Military Assistance that with complete impunity transport military equipment and train and participate in combat with President Reagan's "freedom fighters". It is important to recall that only two days ago *The New York Times* quoted an article in an American magazine in which an American mercenary boasted that he had personally killed 43 Nicaraguan citizens on Nicaraguan soil. We are concerned, and it constitutes a danger to peace in Central America, that that group—Civilian Military Assistance—has stated publicly that it has more than a thousand American mercenaries now carrying out the same activities.

31. Therefore it is clear to everyone—and the photographs we have distributed to Council members demonstrate this—that both the C-47 aircraft and the UH-500D helicopter are of United States manufacture and origin, that the latter was armed, and that they flew combat missions from airports built by the United States in Honduran territory. It is relevant to ask whether the mercenaries flew their own planes from New Orleans to Honduras. If they did, did they not have to turn in a flight plan to the United States Air Force? What reasons did they then give for that flight? If they were under investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as early as April 1984, as has been published in the press, then how did United States Immigration deal with this when they left New Orleans? Who received them in Honduras? Did the mercenaries who entered Honduras have a licence to export weapons to Honduras?

32. We hope that these and other questions will be answered by the United States Government, whether by the State Department or by the United States Mission to the United Nations, since even members of the United States Congress, the press and ordinary citizens are looking for answers to prevent further bloodshed in Nicaragua on the part of anyone. In any case, to make it easier for the State Department and the United States Mission to reply to these and other questions, I wish to quote three textual references from various United States journalists:

> "Congressional sources stated yesterday that the Central Intelligence Agency knew that a United States paramilitary group was sending men to Nicaragua, but it did nothing to detain the volunteers, two of whom died in a rebel air raid."

That was published in the New York *Daily News* on 6 September 1984 and reported by Barbara Rehm.

> "Two Americans involved in aiding Nicaraguan rebels said today"—5 September—"that they received assistance from United States Embassies in Honduras and El Salvador in their effort to provide military equipment to anti-Communist forces in Central America."

That was published in *The New York Times* on 6 September, reported by Philip Taubman.

> "The Treasury Department has issued an arms dealer's license to [Tom] Posey. In his application he stated: 'It is my intention to purchase weapons and military matériel to send to El Salvador with the permission of that Government'."

That was published in *The Boston Globe* and *The Washington Post* on 6 September, reported by George Lardner, Jr.

33. There are many other quotes that could be used by the State Department to get to the bottom of the denunciations publicized in the American press if it really wanted to investigate who the mercenaries are and what links they have with the CIA and thus really enforce its laws.

34. The last time we appealed to the Security Council, the representative of the United States, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, in a moment of lucidity stated:

> "By now the Council must be quite familiar with the thrust of the Nicaraguan complaint, it having been put before this body in one form or another on some six occasions over the past two years. The details change, but the substance of the complaint remains essentially the same." [*See 2525th meeting, para. 73.*]

35. For the first time the representative of the United States said something true about Nicaragua. Of course the details change in so far as the Reagan Administration and its CIA seek new methods to attack Nicaragua: the formation of mercenary task forces, the mining of our ports, air and naval warfare, the destruction of civilian and economic targets and now these latest attacks. But as she herself said in the statement I have just quoted, the substance of the complaint remains essentially the same: the State terrorism practised by the Reagan Administration with the sole purpose of overthrowing our Government and thus preventing the political, economic and social development of the people of Nicaragua and of the other Central American peoples.

36. That official policy—State terrorism—manifested through the actions of the CIA and its mercenaries can also be seen through the direct military presence along the coasts and on the territories of Central America, in the constant holding of joint military and naval manoeuvres and in the building of bases and other military installations in Central America.

37. Because the effect of this is to exacerbate tensions in the region and to obstruct the process aimed at finding a negotiated political settlement, I shall offer some facts concerning the American military presence in the Central American region. We are having a brief summary of that presence distributed as a Security Council document [*S/16744, annex*].

38. First, with regard to naval activities, there have been several in recent months: the Patrolling the Gulf manoeuvres were held between 30 May and 6 June, with the participation of two warships and with the alleged objective of detecting arms trafficking to El Salvador; the air-sea manoeuvres carried out by the CV-67 aircraft carrier *John F. Kennedy* and its task force from 15 to 23 July in Atlantic territorial waters of Nicaragua; and those carried out by the Surface Action Group off the Central American coastline. Nor can we fail to mention the large number of American warships which constantly patrol Central American waters, especially the waters close to Nicaragua.

39. Secondly, as to air activities, between April and August—that is, in a five-month period—there has been a total of 231 reconnaissance flights—in other words, spy flights—over Nicaraguan territory by American aircraft. This amounts to nearly 1.5 flights per day.

40. Thirdly, with regard to military manoeuvres and exercises, the following have taken place: the Relámpago II manoeuvres, in which United States and Honduran troops participated; Granadero I, already mentioned in the earlier debate in the Security Council —two-stage manoeuvres involving the participation of 6,500 United States, Salvadoran and Honduran soldiers; and Operation Lempira, which was also conducted in two stages with the participation of 1,500 United States and Honduran soldiers. We may soon be witnessing, in late 1984 or early 1985, the Ahuas Tara III manoeuvres. This provides a sampling of the large-scale and small-scale manoeuvres conducted by the United States since early 1984 in Central America, all of which only serve to heighten tension in the region and make it more difficult to find a political solution.

41. Fourthly, in connection with the permanent American military presence in Central American territory, there are at present 1,400 United States soldiers permanently stationed on seven American bases and engaged in a wide range of activities. Moreover, there are plans to increase that number to approximately 2,000 troops in the next few days.

42. It is well known and interesting that the presence of American soldiers in Central America—particularly in Honduras—has been unceasing and at a senior level. Among them we would cite General John Basey, of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff; General Wallace H. Nutting, chief of Readiness Command at McDill, Florida; General John A. Wickman, United States Army Chief of Staff; and General Paul Gorman, chief of the United States Southern Command in Panama, who has visited that country on many occasions.

43. Our people and Government know from their own experience the meaning of this whole buildup of the United States military presence in Central American territory and waters in the last three and a half years. What has that buildup meant for our people? It has meant that more than 7,391 of its finest sons—an average of more than 2,266 Nicaraguans per year—have been murdered. It has meant losses of more than 2,275 million cordobas in production and social areas and in infrastructure. The Commander of the Revolution, Daniel Ortega Saavedra, Co-ordinator of the Governing Junta of National Reconstruction, during the main event of the celebration of the fifth anniversary of the Sandinist people's revolution, stated:

> "The percentage of Nicaraguan victims killed during three and a half years of imperialist aggression is 0.3 per cent of the population, while the percentage of American victims killed during the eight and a half years of the criminal and senseless adventure against the heroic people of Viet Nam and against its own people was 0.1 per cent."

44. Our people and Government also know from their own experience the devastation and disasters that come from living under a bloody dynasty, which was the creation of the United States of America and was able to stay in power for 45 years thanks to the United States of America. During that period nearly 200,000 Nicaraguans were murdered. In the final stage of the war of liberation alone, between September 1978 and July 1979, approximately 50,000 Nicaraguans were killed, five of our principal cities were partly destroyed, and we suffered heavy losses in the area of production.

45. As a result of heroism, tenacity and pain, therefore, we are a peace-loving people. We are a people which seeks peace and fights for peace, which builds housing for peace, which educates its people for peace, which establishes health programmes for peace, which promotes the people's culture for peace, which exults in peace and which struggles in the mountains to maintain and defend that peace to which it so greatly aspires and to achieve which it has shed so much blood.

46. Let our enemies and attackers make no mistake: they will not impose peace by war. They may destroy us, but they will never conquer us. We shall be able to reconquer peace in the countryside and in the mountains regardless of the time or sacrifices required. Therefore, the international community and the Security Council must take specific preventive measures to maintain peace. Mr. Reagan cannot try to impose his will without a care for the universal cry for peace or for the costs which could result for his own people and for other peace-loving peoples.

47. Unfortunately, the Central American panorama is dark indeed, and political solutions seem increasingly difficult to achieve. One should not do as the United States is accustomed to doing and apply a double standard as one's everyday political norm. One should not

—one must not—claim to support the multilateral negotiations and bilateral talks now under way while at the same time brazenly waging war and making efforts to increase aggression. One must be serious and responsible.

48. High-level spokesmen of the United States Government, including President Reagan himself, Secretary of State Shultz and Mrs. Kirkpatrick, continue to threaten the Sandinist people's revolution and the Government of National Reconstruction. Their statements, which could clinically be classified as the result of paranoid reflexes, augur destruction and death for us in the near term. They attempt to obstruct the process of institutionalization which is being developed by the revolution, and their sole objective is to isolate us internationally and prepare the political terrain for the invasion which that Government so much desires.

49. Just two months ago President Reagan, reviving his anti-Communist rhetoric during the ceremony concerning the captive cities, took the opportunity to direct at my country accusations of being puppets of the Soviet Union. At the same time, he praised his "freedom fighters", who are none other than CIA mercenaries. More recently, various United States officials, including the President himself, have on several occasions made statements in which they did not discard the possibility of direct intervention in Central America, including Nicaragua, if certain conditions existed that warranted such intervention—for instance, the well-known accusation of interference in the civil war being waged in El Salvador.

50. At the present time, given the military failures of their mercenaries and seeking ways to restore morale, to distract our forces and thereby relieve the pressure, the CIA is developing new fighting tactics, with the presence of American mercenaries. It is trying in this way to keep its forces active and belligerent, with the goal of hampering the electoral process. At the same time, the aim is to be able, through training and military equipment, to convert these forces into a mercenary army that could serve as a spearhead during an invasion. All this, I repeat, is without any thought of the cost that this involves for the people of the United States. It is directed solely to the electoral consequences.

51. References to Nicaragua which appear in the recently approved Republican platform are also of great concern. They promise a future that is grimmer still and even more dangerous for my country. I shall quote these references verbatim:

> "Today, democracy is under assault throughout the hemisphere. Marxist Nicaragua threatens not only Costa Rica and Honduras, but also El Salvador and Guatemala. The Sandinist régime is building the largest military force in Central America, importing Soviet equipment, Eastern bloc and PLO advisers and thousands of Cuban mercenaries. The Sandinist Government has been increasingly brazen in its adoption of Marxism-Leninism. It has systematically persecuted free institutions, including synagogues, schools, the private sector, the free press, minorities and families and tribes throughout Nicaragua. We support the continuation of assistance to Nicaraguan freedom fighters. Nicaragua cannot be allowed to remain a sanctuary."

52. Before continuing, I wish to recall that in the Council's earlier debate I invited Mrs. Kirkpatrick to visit Nicaragua whenever she wished. We extend again that invitation, so that as a good functionary of a republican Government she can see that we are not persecuting anyone in Nicaragua. On the other hand, such things can be seen on the streets of New York—for example, in the treatment of blacks as second-class citizens. An attempt is made to argue that this is the type of thing one sees in Nicaragua.

53. The dangers of war are stalking Central America. Its consequences, costs and results are difficult to predict. It is perhaps easy to predict where they originate, because we know who the attacker is; we know which nations are being attacked. It will, however, be very difficult to predict when and where the war will end. We believe that it is very important to unmask publicly the sole party responsible for the situation of tension and war now being experienced by Central America. It is the United States of America, which, through its aggressive and war-mongering policy, is preventing the achievement of a political solution to Central American problems.

54. In that respect, I wish to affirm emphatically, on behalf of my Government, that Nicaragua is not and never will be a threat to the security of any Central American State—much less to the security of the United States. Do not worry: we are not going to invade Colorado. Such an "invasion" is being given wide publicity in a film now being shown in United States cinemas. On the contrary, it is precisely the United States that constitutes a real threat to the security of the Sandinist people's republic, which the United States is openly attempting to destroy through a war of aggression.

55. We are confronting an extremely serious situation, a situation that at any time could lead to a genuine regional conflagration. The responsibility is in our hands; we must act decisively.

56. Before concluding, I should like—although my delegation has already had the honour of congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month—to tell you personally that I am convinced that your political skill, abilities and revolutionary origins ensure that you will conduct the work of the Council very successfully. I wish also to congratulate Mr. Bassole of Burkina Faso on the excellent work he did last month. It was exactly what we had expected of him.

57. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

58. Mr. SORZANO (United States of America): I have listened with care to the statement by the representative of Nicaragua that we have just heard. I should like to say that the United States rejects it as a description of our role in the region. We note, however, that this is the seventh time that the Sandinist régime has sought to use this forum, not, as mandated in the Charter, to resolve the most urgent problems of peace and security in the world but, instead, as a mere instrument for its own propaganda.

59. We also note with interest that this is not the first time that Nicaragua has come to the Council, on whatever pretext—as it has done today—just as more legitimate forums, most particularly the Contadora process, were beginning to arrive at solutions to the grave problems in the region, solutions which, I might add, would cause the Nicaraguan Government to recommit itself to the democratic system of Government it once solemnly promised the world and its own people it would have.

60. The United States, for its part, has worked and continues to work diligently on behalf of realistic diplomatic and political solutions in Central America. This has included active diplomacy in the context of the Contadora process, including, just yesterday, general high-level talks in Manzanillo, Mexico, between the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua, Mr. Tinoco, and United States Special Envoy for Central America, Mr. Shlaudeman. These meetings between Nicaragua and my Government underscore our commitment to and the importance of the Contadora negotiations as an avenue towards resolution of the crisis in Central America. Many hoped and felt the Contadora process had begun to yield progress despite Nicaraguan intransigence on many of the 21 Contadora objectives, including the reduction of arms and military personnel, elimination of foreign military advisers and troops, an end to support for subversion, adequate means of verification and control and steps towards democratization.

61. However, the Sandinist's baseless allegations of aggression by my Government and by neighbouring Governments of Central America lead me to conclude that their all-too-familiar pattern of running to the Security Council at crucial junctures in the negotiating process is in fact a Sandinist tactic designed to deflect attention once more from their reluctance to negotiate in good faith and settle their problems with their Central American neighbours. During the past years, Nicaragua's approaches to the Security Council have been designed to distract from the underlying problems of the region and to undermine the Contadora process they profess to support. The Sandinists as usual seek to turn reality on its head.

62. The United States has not sent personnel to Nicaragua in order to destabilize its régime. On the other hand we are aware of the presence of numerous Cubans and Libyan military and security advisers in Nicaragua, and it is possible that some might have engaged in military activities, as Colonel Qaddafi recently claimed. The Libyan leader said he had sent troops and arms to Nicaragua to help the Sandinist Government fight the United States on its own ground. Libya's military involvement in Nicaragua is not new, as was so clearly underlined by last year's surreptitious shipment of military equipment to Nicaragua, which was stopped in Brazil.

63. The presence of Libyan personnel, together with Soviet bloc, Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), Basque and other foreign military personnel in Nicaragua, is of serious concern to the United States and to other countries of Central America. One central objective of the Contadora process is precisely the removal from Central America of such foreign military personnel. Colonel Qaddafi's boast of Libya's military presence in Nicaragua, combined with Nicaragua's extraordinary military buildup, again underlines our concerns about the true nature of the Sandinist régime and the threat it poses to its neighbours. Sandinist Interior Minister Tomás Borge recently lauded Libya's "solidarity without frontiers", an echo of the well-known Sandinist goal of "revolution without frontiers".

64. But Nicaragua has other support as well. In addition to Libya, approximately 9,000 Cubans are now in Nicaragua, and of these some 3,000 are military and security personnel attached to the Nicaraguan armed forces and to internal security and intelligence organizations, from the general staff down to individual battalions. The rapid buildup of Nicaraguan military strength from 1979 to the present could not have been possible without the presence of the Cuban military and security advisers and large-scale arms and equipment shipments from the Soviet Union. Military and/or civilian advisers from the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Libya and East Germany are also active in Nicaragua. Their apparent mission is to build a Sandinist-controlled political apparatus and to expand Nicaragua's military and security forces to unprecedented levels. Crucial to the Nicaraguan support system for subversion in Central America are the officers and representatives of guerrilla and subversive groups from elsewhere in Latin America as well as from the Middle East and Africa. These include the PLO, Argentina's Montoneros, Chile's Movement of the Revolutionary Left, Spain's Separatist Basque Homeland and Liberty, and Uruguay's Tupamaros.

65. Their search for support of their failing revolution has also led the Nicaraguan Government into other despicable activities. Formal charges have already led to the indictment of senior Nicaraguan officials who have been implicated in international drug trafficking. Certainly Nicaragua's desperate need for hard currency and its desire to foment instability by providing arms to Latin American guerrilla groups are sufficient motivations to prompt its régime's involvement in illegal international drug trafficking.

66. So while it is here now accusing others of mercenary activities, the Nicaraguan régime itself has for purely mercenary reasons entered into the illegal international narcotics traffic. Thus on 17 July the United States Government filed an official complaint in the United States District Court for Southern Florida, in Miami, charging one Nicaraguan, and not a low-ranking Nicaraguan—Frederico Vaughn, an assistant to Sandinist Interior Minister Borge—and two Colombians with possession, conspiracy to distribute, and importation of cocaine.

67. But that is not all. Nicaragua, while trying to persuade this Council of its beleaguered status due to the alleged activities of my country, has actually been denying justice and democracy to its own people at home. A Miskito Indian representative recently called on the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to denounce the systematic extermination of ethnic Indians in Nicaragua—and I make this reference keeping in mind the apparently off-the-cuff remarks of my Nicaraguan colleague about the conditions in New York City.

68. The Reverend Silvio Diaz Thompson, in a speech to the Commission in Geneva on 13 March 1984, listed a whole series of human rights violations which had been perpetrated by the Sandinist régime since it came to power in Nicaragua in 1979 against minority Indian groups such as the Miskitos, the Sumos, the Ramas and the Creoles. The cases he describes include massacre, torture, summary execution, rape, forced labour, disappeared persons, mass exodus into the neighbouring countries of Honduras and Costa Rica, the burning of churches and houses and religious persecution. On 5 January 1984 some 200 Sandinist soldiers crossed into Honduras to the communities of Kiwastara and Soumlaya and attacked, raped and murdered the 28 Miskito families which had been living there as refugees since 1981. Diaz Thompson said that a survivor of the massacre, Carmelo Vargas, recognized the Sandinist leader who led the attack, Sonder Escobar, and that the Government of Nicaragua had full responsibility.

69. The Government of Nicaragua has, of course, announced elections for 4 November, after much indecision and delay. The leadership of the Sandinist National Liberation Front has, however, said that they will not be "bourgeois" elections and will only serve to "ratify" the revolution. Accordingly the Nicaraguan Government has hindered the opposition's access to the media and its ability to organize rallies.

70. But the Council does not have to depend on our characterization and impression of the upcoming elections in Nicaragua. Let us hear from one of the Sandinist leaders himself, Mr. Bayardo Arce. The 8 August edition of *The Miami Herald* reported the remarks made by Bayardo Arce during a mid-May meeting with the Central Committee of the Nicaraguan Socialist Party. According to the *Herald*, Arce labelled the upcoming Nicaraguan elections as "bothersome" and indicated that they would not have been scheduled had it not been for United States pressure. Arce added that a Sandinist election victory would result in a "red constitution" and perhaps the removal of the "facade of political pluralism" and the establishment of the "party of the revolution, the single party". Commandante Bayardo Arce asked rhetorically, "Why should we communists wear different shirts if in any case a real and concrete socialism is being built through the Sandinist-front strategy?"

71. We should not be surprised, therefore, after this, among many other admissions of what the Nicaraguan Government is and what it seeks to do, that there are many people in the world who oppose them. That is natural. Some of the opposition is inside and some is outside their country. Some private American citizens have apparently been involved in this event. But it has been common for both sides in the Central American conflicts to solicit and receive aid from private American groups. The guerrillas of El Salvador and the Nicaraguan Government have themselves appealed through representatives in the United States for private American aid. There are no reliable figures for the total value, of course, but it has been estimated that it has run into the millions of dollars.

72. Some Americans also work for the Sandinist Government. According to an article by Dan Williams in the *Los Angeles Times* of 27 August, 700 or more Americans work in Nicaragua in support of the Sandinist Government, some in ranking positions of the régime. They are part of a large brigade of foreign Sandinist sympathizers known as "internationalists"; some are volunteers and some are paid. But, despite those facts, neither El Salvador nor Honduras has ever come before this body to complain about the activities of non-governmental volunteers. Only Nicaragua uses the Council for this purpose.

73. I shall conclude by stating once more that the United States is not trying to overthrow the Sandinist Government. Our relations with Nicaragua have deteriorated because, instead of keeping their promises about human rights and pluralistic democracy, the Sandinists have developed increasingly close military ties to Cuba and the Soviet Union, tightened their internal repression, supported guerrilla insurgency in El Salvador and terrorism in Honduras and Costa Rica and continued an extensive military buildup that threatens the security of their neighbours.

74. Mr. CHAMORRO MORA (Nicaragua) [*interpretation from Spanish*]: At one point or another as I listened to the representative of the United States make his statement, I got the impression that this was a reflection of United States policy throughout its history, particularly in Latin America. He made a number of references that rather amazed me, because we would really like to have that power. He referred to so many revolutionary movements in Latin America which Nicaragua was helping that we would need to have the

power of the United States to be able to do that. That is just the kind of thing the United States has been doing in Latin America for the past century. There have been, I believe, some 100 acts of intervention, including a number in Nicaragua in the 30 years of our history.

75. But I have asked to speak only because certain of the expressions of the United States representative caught my attention. They really surprised me because, in our view, they mean that the moral values of American society are lower than one would have expected. To justify his defence, he mentioned that Nicaragua complains to the Security Council on any pretext, and that it does so in general when there is a process of negotiation in Central America, whether Contadora or Manzanillo. He does not know how little value the United States Government—and Mr. Sorzano is its representative—ascribes to the citizens of that country who died on Nicaraguan territory while participating in armed action. If he claims that that is not a sufficient reason to complain to the Security Council, the primary organ entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security, then he really attaches very little value to United States citizens. And that amazes me, since in Nicaragua we are very much concerned at the death of any one of us, and for the death of one of us we would have recourse to the Council as many times as necessary.

76. On the other hand, I want to make clear to Mr. Sorzano that, yes, in Nicaragua United States citizens have been regularly joining work brigades that tackle production tasks and develop solidarity. It could be, as he mentioned, that there are some technicians being paid with what little money my Government has. But in point of fact, unless I am sadly mistaken, none of them have been participating in armed actions, as did the two Americans who recently died in Nicaragua. The Americans who are in Nicaragua are engaged in peaceful civilian constructive work, not in military activities, which is more than one can say for the CIA mercenaries in El Salvador and Honduras.

77. With regard to the Manzanillo talks Mr. Sorzano mentioned, it is true that yesterday the fifth round of talks between Deputy Minister Tinoco and the Special Envoy for Central America ended, as I mentioned in my statement. We are concerned and grieved to see the United States, the greatest empire in the world, applying a double standard: that while it meets with an underdeveloped country like Nicaragua, with barely three million people, and goes through the motions of seeking political solutions to the problems of Central America, at the same time it attacks us and sends Americans to die on Nicaraguan soil. That duplicitous policy reveals the lack of sincerity on the part of the United States Government.

78. Another point which I have made several times in Security Council debates is that indeed we do have Libyan, Soviet and French weapons, and we have American weapons left from the time of Somoza, since you haven't wanted to sell us any. We shall continue acquiring weapons wherever and whenever we can, so long as the United States continues its acts of aggression against us, because we cannot fail to defend our sovereignty and territorial integrity.

79. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) [*interpretation from Russian*]: The character of the statement of the representative of the United States, Mr. Sorzano, compels me to ask to be allowed to speak to make a number of observations.

80. First, the statement of the American representative to the effect that the United States does not intend to overthrow the Government of Nicaragua is fallacious from the beginning to the end, because in parallel with that and other similar statements the United States virtually openly has continued to finance, arm and train mercenaries whom it has been sending to Nicaraguan territory.

81. Secondly, why is the United States doing that? We have heard from the representative of the United States the old refrain of a Soviet or Red threat. But the issue lies elsewhere than in that non-existent threat. In March of last year we had an opportunity to remind the representative of the United States that history has known 81 instances of United States intervention against Latin American countries. The overwhelming majority of those instances of intervention occurred when the Soviet Union did not exist. The reason for United States acts of intervention against Latin American countries is its consistent policy of not allowing the autonomous economic, political and social development of Latin America and attempting to impose on Latin American countries the kind of system preferred by the United States.

82. Since March 1983, when I cited the list of United States interventions in Latin America, there has been another case of United States intervention against a small Latin American country, Grenada. As of today, the list of instances of United States intervention against Latin American countries now appears as follows: against Mexico, 14 acts of intervention; Cuba, 13; Panama, 11; Nicaragua, 10; the Dominican Republic, 9; Colombia, 7; Honduras, 7; Haiti, 5; Puerto Rico, 3; Guatemala, 2; and, lastly, Grenada, 1.

83. So as of today, the United States has on 82 occasions used force against a total of 11 Latin American countries. These are facts that the United States representative will not be able to deny.

84. I have one final comment having to do with the way that United States representatives, both in the Security Council and outside it, keep bringing up this "Red threat". This persistence compels me to repeat the description of United States policy that was given in this same chamber three years ago. The present policy of the United States in the international arena reminds one of the conduct of a mad bull which sees the colour

red everywhere. It sees red everywhere not because it is actually there but because its own eyes are filled with the blood of madness.

85. Mr. SORZANO (United States of America): I could not let pass this opportunity provided by my colleague of the Soviet Union to talk a little about history.

86. It is indeed true—but I am not quite ready to ascertain the exactitude of the numbers provided by the Soviet representative—that in the past the United States has intervened in Latin American countries. It is equally true that those countries today are sovereign and independent nations; for proof of that one has only to look up the records of the last sessions of the General Assembly and see how many of them voted against us.

87. On the other hand, how many interventions has the Soviet Union committed and how many is it committing right now? There are 135,000 troops in Afghanistan engaging in total demolition of entire villages, producing millions of refugees, not to speak of the countries of Eastern Europe that were invaded by the Soviet Union and continue to be under subjugation. If anyone does not believe that, I challenge him to find any one of those countries voting against the Soviet Union during the last session of the General Assembly.

88. So each country has a history; no country is perfect. But I would be willing to state that American intervention pales compared to the intervention of my Soviet colleague's country.

89. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) [*interpretation from Russian*]: A characteristic feature of American diplomacy, including in the Security Council, is that American representatives never engage in battle on the battlefield itself. They are always moving off in diversionary manoeuvres. This means that United States representatives are not prepared to argue the substance of a question under discussion. The United States representatives were saying here that the Latin American countries which were at some time in the past the recipients of intervention by the United States are now living happily. But what if the United States were to look southwards to its Mexican neighbour? The result of United States intervention against Mexico was the annexation of more than half of Mexican territory. Ten states in the United States were carved out of Mexican territory—six in their entirety, four partially.

90. The PRESIDENT: The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will be fixed in consultation with the members of the Council.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.

NOTE

[1] *Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v. United States of America)* (International Court of Justice publication No. 499).

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61313—January 1993—2,050